



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the democratic import of Castelvetro's concept of poetry, and to credit the latter warmly with his rejection of the imitation of classic texts; just as it is valuable to have in this detailed exposition the fuller treatment of many points—the theory of *difficulté vaincue*, the dickering with the notion of verisimilitude, various preferences such as of the particular to the universal, etc.—which did not fall within the perspective of Croce and Spingarn.

If, in calling attention to the very real value of chapters II–X, we exclude XI–XII, it was because the latter contain Mr. Charlton's own criticism of Castelvetro. And here we must distinguish. It was surely laudable in the author to be chary of personal dogmatism; yet dogmatism is often, even when mistaken, an incisive weapon of criticism. At any rate, Mr. Charlton's eclecticism is not as yet fully self-conscious. To me it seems that in this matter of esthetics we must either use the category "beauty" or else we must abandon it. There is no middle ground between it and the theory of expression on which to build a composite system. To be sure, on whichever side we stand, we may chance to hit on some specks of truth, and Mr. Charlton, with one leg in each camp, hits on a good many. But after all, every vicious method lives precisely by its virtues. Mr. Charlton, for instance, is willing to meet Castelvetro on the preceptual ground of "beauty." He is willing to refute Aristotle with Ruskin. We find aid to creation, he says, "in the maintenance of a current of ideas" rather than in "a specific technical cyclopaedia." And so far admirable. But again he says: "Nobody believes now, that the poet is just a man as other men. . . . The artist has in him some sparks of divine inspiration . . . and needs somewhat of the gustation of the gods." Is not the one state of mind the satire of the other? They both alternate to a certain extent throughout these chapters.

Mr. Charlton's orientation is in the direction of a scholarship that is fruitful. It still lacks perfection of research method and definiteness of critical aim.

A. A. LIVINGSTON.

Columbia University.

GOETHE, WILHELM MEISTERS THEATRALSICHE SENDUNG

Goethes Werke. Herausgegeben im Auftrage der Grossherzogin Sophie von Sachsen, 51. und 52. Band. Weimar, Hermann Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1911. iv + 311; iv + 301 pp.

Goethe. Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung. Nach der Schulthess'schen Abschrift herausgegeben von HARRY MAYNO. Stuttgart und Berlin, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1911. xl + 416 pp.

Goethe. Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung. Nach der Schulthess'schen Abschrift zum ersten Male herausgegeben von HARRY MAYNO. Mit fünf Bildnissen und fünf Faksimiles. Stuttgart und Berlin, J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1911. 8 + 410 pp.*

When the bulk of Goethe's letters and papers became accessible to scholars upon the death of Walther von Goethe in 1885, it was hoped that the long-lost *Urfaust* and *Urmeister* would again come to light. Neither of these hopes was at that time fulfilled—Goethe had evidently destroyed the earlier manuscripts after the *Faust* and the *Lehrjahre* in their published form had been completed. In the year 1887, however, a copy of the *Urfaust*, made by Fräulein von Göchhausen, was discovered among her papers, and now finally, after the lapse of another quarter of a century, the *Urmeister* comes to light, in a copy made by another friend of Goethe's, Barbara Schulthess of Zurich, and her daughter. Goethe's old habit of allowing unpublished pieces to circulate in manuscript among his friends has also in this case preserved for posterity the original version of one of his masterpieces.

Like the *Urfaust*, the *Urmeister* had lain for a century among family papers, until by chance it was submitted to Gustav Billeter, a Zurich teacher, who discovered its import.¹ Eventu-

* In the following review the above editions are cited, respectively, as (1), (2), and (3).

¹ Goethe, *Wilhelm Meisters theatralische Sendung. Mitteilungen über die wiedergefundene erste Fassung von Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahren* von Dr. Gustav Billeter. Zürich, 1910, vii + 127 pp.

ally the manuscript came into the possession of the Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv at Weimar. The editorship of the work was entrusted to Harry Maync, of Bern, and originally the plan was also to have it published in Switzerland. Complications ensued, however, as the Cotta firm, which had published the *Ausgabe letzter Hand* and the *Nachgelassene Werke*, claimed the work by virtue of its right acquired with the *Nachgelassene Werke*. The matter was finally settled by the issue of the three editions above cited, all of which are edited by Maync. The text of all three editions bears the inscription: "Copyright 1911 by J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger Stuttgart," while the critical apparatus, which is only contained in (1), is copyrighted by the Goethe- und Schiller-Archiv.

The bibliophile-edition (3), by express statements in the preface as well as in the title, purports to be the first and original printing of the three editions under consideration. A comparison of the text, however, refutes this statement, which was only intended as a bait for the lover of first editions. To prove this, one need only look up the misprints of the Weimar edition, some 30 in number, cited in the apparatus: approximately a third of these have been corrected in (2) and (3). Several of these, furthermore, are quite unequivocal: on p. 100, 18 of Vol. 51, the ms. has the spelling *Volkans*, for which the editor at first decided to put *Vulcans*: upon second thought, the form *Volcans* was restored, and this spelling is found in (2) and (3), while for (1) it had to be noted in the Errata. Similarly, on p. 39, 14 of Vol. 52, the spelling *di Retti*, as found in the ms., remains in (1), and is accordingly noted in the Errata, while (2) and (3) have the normalized spelling *de Retti*.

It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the text of the Weimar edition was *printed* first, even though the bibliophile-edition may have been *published* first. Whether (2) was printed before or after (3) is impossible to determine, as their texts show no differences. For ordinary purposes, therefore, the cheap edition will suffice, and it is, as a matter of fact, superior to the bibliophile-edition, in that it has page

headings, giving the book and chapter in question, while (3) has no headings at all, thus making it difficult to find a particular passage. For scholarly purposes, the Weimar edition is the only one to be considered, as it is only by means of its critical apparatus that one can distinguish the emendations of the editor. These emendations are very numerous, as the ms. is corrupt in many places. The orthography has been normalized, first by comparison of Goethe's contemporary letters, and secondly by reference to the letters of Barbara Schulthess, one of which is included in the fac-similes of the bibliophile-edition. Where the *Lehrjahre* afford a parallel text, corrections are easily made, at other places one instinctively feels that there is something wrong with the text, without being able definitely to restore the original. For example, Vol. 51, p. 4, 5, the text reads: "sie hoffte, dass sie (*i. e.*, Kinder und Enkel) gescheuter sein sollten, als sie bei ihrem Leben nicht hatte sehen können." One is tempted to emend: "als sie sie bei" . . . or else, "nicht hatten sein können." Vol. 52, p. 58, 13, the text reads: "und in der Nachbarschaft die Freichore herumschwärmten." Why this was not changed to "Freicorps" is inconceivable, especially as the latter form occurs later, p. 183, 8, where it is also supported by the reading of the *Lehrjahre*.

A detailed comparison of the text of the *Urmeister* with that of the *Lehrjahre* is beyond the scope of this article. To give a general idea, however, it may be stated that the *Urmeister*, as we have it, extends only to the beginning of the Fifth Book of the *Lehrjahre*, where Meister agrees to join Serlo's company. The second half of the later version, including the *Bekenntnisse einer schönen Seele*, is therefore lacking in the *Urmeister*. The latter begins with the childhood of Wilhelm, including the account of the Puppet-play which the grandmother makes, and the children's theatricals, all of which are given later in the *Lehrjahre*, as mere reminiscences of Wilhelm. The art-collection of the grandfather is nowhere alluded to, nor does the connoisseur appear, whom Wilhelm meets in the *Lehrjahre*.

Werner, whose father does not figure at all in the original story, becomes the brother-in-law of Wilhelm before the latter sets out on his journey. There is only one journey, and the episode of Melina and his wife is brought in differently. Later on, Wilhelm meets these again in the company of Madame de Retti, who does not figure at all in the *Lehrjahre*. It is here that Meister first goes upon the stage, to play the character of Darius in the first performance of his own tragedy of *Belsazar*, an extract from which is given, together with an outline of the play. At the Count's castle there is a secretary who writes plays, and has charge of the dealings with the actors, whilst in the *Lehrjahre* this character is combined with that of the Baron. The final episode between Wilhelm and the Countess, at the end of the Third Book of the *Lehrjahre*, is lacking in the *Urmeister*, and as this motivates the subsequent development of several of the characters in the *Lehrjahre*, it would seem that Goethe had not as yet formulated the later plan.

In developing this plan, years afterward, it was to be expected that Goethe would not always be able to harmonize the different settings of the two stories. For example, in the *Lehrjahre*, Vol. 21, p. 136, Wilhelm is represented as riding along on horseback, while a number of pedestrians successively catch up with him, greet him, and leave him behind. The incongruity of this picture, which had always struck me, is now explained, for in the *Urmeister*, from which the scene is taken bodily, Wilhelm makes this part of the journey on foot.

W. KURRELMMEYER.

The Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE

A FURTHER NOTE ON MUSSET

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* for April, 1912, I pointed out that Musset, in the famous *Nuit de Décembre*, plagiarized from himself by borrowing almost verbatim a passage from an earlier and less known poem, *A Laure*. It may be in-

teresting to note that in another case he reversed this process, transferring a passage from a well-known work to an obscure one. In *On ne badine pas avec l'amour*, Act I, Scene IV, Perdican exclaims: "O patrie! patrie, mot incompréhensible! l'homme n'est-il donc né que pour un coin de terre, pour y bâtir son nid et pour y vivre un jour?" Twenty-one years later, in one of Musset's last poems, *Retour*, these words reappear as follows:

O patrie! ô patrie! ineffable mystère!
Mot sublime et terrible! inconcevable amour!
L'homme n'est-il donc né que pour un coin de terre,
Pour y bâtir son nid, et pour y vivre un jour?

Musset had to do little but find a pair of rhymes, in order to change his fine prose into verse.

GEO. N. HENNING.

The George Washington University.

THE SOURCE OF *Christ* 416 ff.

It has not been observed by investigators of the sources of the Old English *Christ* that the lines (416 ff.)

Eala! hwæt þæt is wraeclic wrixl in wera life,
þætte moncynnes milde sceyppend
onfēng sēt fæmnan flæsc unwemme,
ond sio weres friga [w]iht ne cūpe,
nē þurh sād ne cwōm sigores āgend
monnes ofer moldan

are based upon the antiphon: "O admirabile commercium: Creator generis humani animatum corpus sumens, de Virgine nasci dignatus est: et procedens homo sine semine, largitus est nobis suam Deitatem." This antiphon is employed, according to the Roman use, at Lauds and Vespers of the feast of the Circumcision (or octave of the Nativity) and at Lauds of the vigil of the Epiphany, and it occurs already in the Gregorian antiphonary (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, LXXVIII, 741). Though the poet has handled the material with characteristic freedom, the closeness of